DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 459 EA 013 918

AUTHOR Garberina, Margaret Ramsey
TITLE Rites of Passage: Role Socialization Among Novice Principals.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Washington, DC, December 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Peer Influence; *Principals; Questionnaires; *Socialization

ABSTRACT

This study identifies the factors leading to the socialization of new principals. The study examined the identification of new principals, the socialization or learning processes that lead to the principal's professional development, the extent to which other principals (peers) play a part in that socialization, the extent to which the selection process is a part of the socialization process, the provisions the school district makes to play a part in the socialization, and the nature of the school's social system (formal and informal) and the principal's role in it. The principals in the large Northeastern school district studied gained their knowledge of their job from three sources--observations of principals while they were in other positions, conversations about the role with a principal while they were in another role, and informal transmittal of experiences from other principals once they were on the job. Despite inservice training by districts and professional organizations, the principals felt that they must learn their jobs while performing them. While inservice programs train principals for their behavior as part of the district bureaucracy, many important areas such as how to properly use their time and how to handle stressful problems are not covered. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208459

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Rites of Passage: Role Socialization Among Novice Principals

Margaret Ramsey Garberina
St. John's University - New York

for

American Anthropological Association
Washington, D.C.
December 1980

EA 013 918

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.R. Garberina

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"I learned this job by doing it." Over the past fifteen years, this author has heard that phrase again and again. Essentially that is true of any job, despite years of training, preparation programs, or courses. While that is especially true of technical application, it is also a fact of life in the professions. What may be surprising is the fact that professionals, especially school professionals, continue to voice this sentiment, despite the lengthy and expensive preparation programs they complete, despite lengthy and expensive certification requirements they must complete. And this is to say nothing of the tedious process, both in terms of time, expense and detail that school districts devote to the selection of such "prepared" professionals. Yet the problem remains that much of what school administrators, especially principals need to know, they learn on the job.

This study was an attempt to identify what factors lead to the socialization of new, or novice, principals. The following were examined: 1) identification of the new principal 2) socialization or learning processes that lead to the professional development of the principal 3) the extent to which other principals (peers) play a part in the socialization process 4) the extent to which the selection process is a part of the socialization process as a learning experience 5) what provisions, if any, were made on the part of the school district to aid in the socialization of the new principal 6) what was the nature of the social system, formal and informal, and what was the principal's role in the system.

The role of principal was examined because it is considered the core, the pivotal position of educational administration of school districts. Structurally, the principalship is the heart of the line and staff bureaucracy prevalent in school systems. This is a view generally held in any text of educational administration that the sources would be two numerous to present. Gross and Herriot are two of the best known in that field to hold to that view. Historically, the term "principal" derives from "principal teacher" and refers to a time when the principalship was a delegation of responsibility to a central or head teacher; a kind of teaching and curricular coordinator who also became responsible for general management of the school plant or building, the management of resources, both books and personnel, and any related paperwork. In time, the "principal teacher" became a necessity because the complexity of tasks and school populations increased. The principal teacher became the principal as the role became more clearly defined, and as the need became apparent for one individual who could oversee the complete management of the staff necessary to implement instruction for students. This clearly delineated the tasks of principal as different from those of the teacher. While the teacher was (and is) responsible for the instruction of those students, the principal's task is to see that the goals of instructional program within the school are being met. The principal then is clearly a curricular planner and manager, but most of all is the instructional leader of the school, despite the fact that most principals are no longer principal teachers; they no

longer in fact teach.

Just as for years the principal teacher had teaching experience, today's principal almost always has had teaching experience at the elementary and/or secondary school level. The teaching experience is a built-in factor as a partial requisite for principal certification without which a principal cannot be appointed. Usually around three to five years teaching experience plus requisite coursework in educational administration is required for the state certification of a principal. Without that certification, the prospective principal cannot take the necessary exams and/or interviews to be considered for appointment to a position as administrator of a school. So, it is no accident, but rather a built in feature of principalship perspective that teaching is not only the usual and required, but the proper preparation for the principalship.

Although studies have focused on the socialization and training of teachers, very little direct data exists on the socialization of school principals, especially within the school districts they serve. The methods for training as well as the content of coursework is generally agreed, but how principals learn their role is not clear. Nor is there discussion of the policies and practices which the school district bureaucracy fosters that socialize the neophyte principal. Additionally, the formal as well as informal structures, such as peer group and professional organizations, shape the principal in both administrative functions and social behavior. Such role socialization and apprenticeship as a budding administrator is a learned behavior

existing in an educational milieu that is both definitive and prescriptive. This study examined the process by which principals were inducted, initiated, and accepted through the rites of passage of the principalship in a large northeastern city. While the particular elements of the study may not apply to every school system, the process of socialization of principals remains much the same across school districts.

Boyan (1965) examined the socialization of school administrators. Kenneth McIntyre (1965) spoke about the selection process of elementary school principals. Most educational theorists of educational administration and organizational domains have spoken toward those concerns that inform the research of administrators such as the principal. These would include Bidwell (1965), Lane, Corwin, and Monahan (1966), Katz and Kahn (1966), Hoy and Miskel (1978). Most studies that would seem to relate to the socialization of the principal do so more or less indirectly because they stress the dynamic factor of leadership; i.e., Kunz and Hoy (1976), and Miskel (1974). Other studies stress the professional in the school bureaucracy and emphasize the principal's ability to succeed based on an awareness of a school body politic; i.e., Hoy and Aho (1973), a study of high school principal succession, and Carlson (1962) on executive succession and organizational change.

Although studies have examined such topics as loyalty; Hoy and Williams (1971), Murray and Corenblum (1966), and administrative styles; Gouldner (1958), Glaser (1965), Peabody (1962), Katz (1968), it is

clear that there is a dearth of ethnographic or other material on socialization of school administrators. Most of what does exist must be inferred from other studies as is presented in the preceding case stated above.

This author chose to examine the nature of principal socialization network. Primarily this framework draws from Adams (1975, 1977). Adams defined power as the ability of a person or social unit to influence the conduct and decision making of another through the control over the forms of energy (social, physical) in the environment of the person. Among the forms of dependent power, Adams names three kinds of power activities: granting, allocation, and delegation. It is within this particular context that the socialization of principals is examined within the bureaucratic exchange system called the school district. Both the formal energy system, the school district, and the informal energy system, peer group organizations, are examined within the anthropological context as a rite of passage. Peer group organizations were considered as part of the informal energy system because membership remained elective, despite the fact that most principals belonged to one or more of them.

What principals <u>do</u> need to learn has been formulated. These formulations do seem to be consistent with the assumptions that had been formulated during the field collection stage of this study. Barrileaux (1972) notes the requirements for training with behavioral objectives a standardized part. He stresses that process be diagnostic, prescriptive, implementive, and, evaluative. This last process, evaluative, relates to Bohannon's (1980) article in which he suggests

that the bridge or link between anthropology and the policy sciences is evaluation.

Nicholson (1972) suggests a strong principal initiated set of behaviors for principals who must now face the mounting problem of performance accountability, a current, vague evaluative procedure being utilized in school districts.

The Performance Appraisal process is often learned in school districts by administrators in in-service workshops and sessions. Caldwell (1979), also suggests that competency based approaches for administration should be learned by the in-service process, but that in-service programs are a critical problem area in school district. Caldwell suggest that assessment (evaluation) and in-service of administrators is often haphazard.

The best single piece on effective principalships comes from Roland Barth (1980). As Barth states "Despite university efforts to certify thousands of aspiring principals, their programs alone will never be sufficient, if only because no one knows what the principal will face until the situation or problem presents itself."

Barth also stresses the importance of support from within the school building, support from other principals, support from central administration, and support from outside the system as critical. The latter category is almost non-existent; but as time goes on may become more important in terms of in-service programs, and workshops for principals (and other administrators as a business proposition for agencies, consortiums, and consultants.

In all of the literature, only one study (Mascaro 1976) approximates the study presented herewith. Mascaro's study, however, was strictly field observations, or rather interviews conducted for one year with

six principals. Mascaro's study of early on the job socialization concluded that principals expect to effect change if they had no previous experience as vice-principal or principal. He also indicated that they evolve a new perspective which is changed through requirements of the job rather than interaction with other role occupants. The major criticism of Mascaro's study is the limited sample and the assumption on his part that one year is the time span involved for principal socialization. Also Mascaro's conclusions could not be drawn from such a small sample nor are they generalizable to other school systems.

A questionnaire was constructed for use in this study. The major categories were drawn from emergent themes that were collected during the field study. An analysis of variance was then utilized. (The appendix contains the bulk of the statistical information*.) Out of a sample of 54 principalships, 20 responded to the sample. One person refused to respond, when contacted on a follow-up call. Two persons were not actually novice principals but had lost their schools through school attrition, (population decline) and so they declined to answer the questionnaire on the basis that they did not meet the sample criteria which was appointed since 1975; within the last five years. Of the 54 participants identified by the principals professional organization, 22 were still auxilary principals who had not been assigned to a "permanent" school. Of the whole sample (54), 26 had received permanent assignment. The two principals who chose not to respond because of sample criteria were both in the auxilary group numbering 22. The principal who refused to respond was a "regularly" assigned principal, he had been assigned "permanently" to a school. Because of declining enrollments no school was ever truly "permanent" and thus a principal whose school was closed could be reassigned on the basis of availability and seniority. Thus principals who had just been assigned a "permanent" school would have the lowest seniority and thus have the greatest chance of being bumped. (Although overall system seniority counted, in an inbred system, older administrators would also have system seniority; thus the general rule of thumb

*Any other information is available upon request.

described still holds.)

On the basis of grounding whatever theory might have emerged, some simple observations were made over the period of two years and three months. During that period of time, the author held two different positions which allowed her to gain entry and access to administrative data gained from observations. Since it was the author's role to be in the schools and school district offices for purposes other than those observations of administrative behavior the remarks conversations and behavioral observations made were spontaneous and non-directive. In other words, the administrators tended to be most open and formal about the information which the author was not officially seeking. (And least open and formal about the information which the author was officially seeking.) Therefore, since that informal information most often emerged unsolicited, the author felt encouraged to trust the honesty and openness of the expression. While the motivations or myth-building behavior might in part explain such unsolicited self remarks about a principal's role, duties, learning experiences etc. the validity of such comments lie in their re-occurring nature. For whatever school or school office the author went to, the remarks about learning the role of the principal from the principal themselves tended to be extremely similar. Despite the age difference in geographical location of the school and size, the principals tended to form a composite picture among themselves in terms of their role socialization as principals. One of the major assumptions formed previous to this time was that principals (and other

administrators) knew what to do when they became principals; that they might have some difficulties in terms of application of knowledge and/or preparation programs, or perhaps a difficulty in moving from the role of teacher to principal; but that they would feel and be prepared to handle the role. The data indicated early in collection that such was not the case. The author had also previously assumed that the school district prepared budding principals for their role. In other words, that their role was not just the visible items of responsibility: teachers, students, instructional programs, budgets, school plant and so on, but role as that intangible part of administrative responsibility. Items or areas that one knew they must handle such as instructional leader, staff director, human relations coordinator; the titles that called for expertise and a battery of skills and decision making abilities. In summary, the author had assummed, as many of the principals themselves had before their appointment, that they would know who they would be in each of their role responsibilities, and how they would be able to carry out their part in the many interactions they would be involved.

The author began to see a need for clarifying how principals did learn their role and what part the school district played in this during the preliminary field work, the author also saw the emergence of the importance of the professional organizations, unions, and fraternal organizations that played a part in the socialization of new principals. The fraternal organizations were seen by the principals as of tremendous importance in principal selection and ranking on

examinations. They also saw them as important in terms of career mobility and promotion within the school district.

Principals also mentioned other peers they could call on regularly for aid or mutual assistance. Sometimes these were principals at a neighboring school. Such proximate neighbors often would lunch together and exchange shop talk. This broke a favorite myth also expressed by most principals that they never get to eat lunch because they are so busy and/or that if they do eat, it's in their office while doing work, seeing teachers, students etc.. It became clear that principals felt, despite "the lunch myth" that it was useful, helpful, and in some cases important to have colleagues to confer with, whether at lunch, by phone, or at other functions, school district or otherwise. While it is not the purpose of this study to actually chart the networks of such informal colleagial assistance, it was clear from the field observations that such networks did exist, with most often, overlapping membership. It is on the basis of such colleagial friendships that ad hoc membership groups are formed, the type described as S.P.I.N.'S. by Bohannon 1980 (A.A. 82: 3, 521) referring to Virginia Hine's acronym for a Segmented, Polycephalous, Idea-based Netwrok. Such groups often appear within and among administrator groups, and like the ad-hoc-groups of A.A.A., they can form under the aegis of a large, "parent", organization in groups existing because of mutual affiliation with (not within) National Association of Elementary School Principals and so on. These groups also exist within smaller school districts, such as an ad-hoc group formed for the specific

purpose of identifying negotiating concerns for administrators and formulating recommendations for a negotiating package.

Sometimes these are neighboring principals who call on each other as peers for handling "sticky" community problems, or something as simple as loaning needed auditorium seats for a play.

The access to older; more experienced principals and the peer relationship established with them was also an expressed concern, not only by novice principals, but by older principals as well. It was always felt apparently that someone always knew more about something based on experience and that these older, wiser (?) and more experienced principals could be drawn on for information, solutions, but more importantly, also as allies in terms of informal coalitions, or allies in terms of seeking aid at a higher level in the school system by representation for the younger peer. Such cases reminded the author very much of Castenedas alliance with a man of power (Don Juan) as source of knowledge and as an intermediary in seeking power from higher sources.

Having sorted the above areas from the preliminary field observations, the author was able to summarize a group of preliminary assumptions. These are as follows:

1.) Principals feel a lack of learning on a formal basis about their roles.

2.) This lack is best described by their own expressed comments which are commonly shared.

3.) Many of the visible areas of responsibility (i.e. plant, staff, etc.) as well as intangible areas, i.e. skill, performance, expertise, manner, of principals were expressed as areas they had not learned in college preparation programs, school district programs, in-service programs, professional programs or other formal, structured programs.

4.) That many skills and areas principals had learned resulted from associations with peers.

5.) That many skills and areas principals learned from the process of selection.

6.) That expectations could be derived by inference from the process of selection from a visible system of rewards to members (or participants) of that selection process.

From the preceding sections, the authors methods fell into two phases during collection. 1.) a field observation period when the role of complete participant (Gold 1958) 2.) a data collection period where statistical means by use of a questionnaire was employed. During this period of time, any comments of principals and/or observations were made with the author as participant observer (Gold, op.cit.)

so that informants would know that the period of collection was taking place. However, once the questionnaire was constructed and sent out any field data was discarded and not used so as to avoid contamination.

As stated previously, field methods were utilized when the author held one of two positions within the school system. Statistical information was collected when the author left that school system.

Access to names and schools of novice principals was provided by the principal's and administrators professional organization, which functioned for all intents and purposes as its union and collective bargaining agent. The president of that organization then gave a cover sheet endorsing the study and asking for support in participation. This provided some extremely useful opportunities for the author: 1) research could be more direct since the Research Division could be bypassed. Many areas might have been eliminated in the questionnaire. Essentially the research division was comprised of staff personnel, who neither had been administrators, trained administrators, nor essentially observed administration practices in from a grounded basis (Glaser & Strauss 1967). The other opportunity it presented was an official sanction for a study that otherwise would have been difficult. In a "strike year" along with severe budget cuts, principals were not overly thrilled to answer any questions. Had this organization not provided the letter from the president, the response and quality of response would have been almost nil.

Principals of 5 years were selected because no exam had been given

since 1975. Although an exam had been given in 1979, the eligibility (rank) list had not moved. So the natural boundary for marking novices grew from the cyclical system of the most current list in use, which was 1975. When the 1979 list does begin "to move", when candidates do begin to fill vacancies, the 1975 group structurally and functionally (by their own expressed perceptions) can be viewed as "new" or "novice."

Analysis of the data for individual questions showed the following:

Confident at the .01 level that all principals in the population have over ten years experience in education, teaching, supervising, and administrating.

Confident at the .05 level that on a scale of from 13 (highest ranking) to 65 (lowest ranking) the mean principals rating of their own socialization:

for in-service programs provided by professional organization union lies within the interval 58.96 to 65;

for in-service programs provided by the school district lies within the interval 41.40 to 52.60;

for knowledge of the principalship gained through on-the-job experience as an appointed building principal lies within the interval 15.31 to 23.09.

Significant correlational relationships were found to exist between the following pairs of items at these reported levels of significance:

Confidant at the .05 level that a significant relationship exists between:

on-the-job experience as an auxiliary principal and knowledge of the principalship gained through

observation of a principal while a director, supervisor or other administrative position;

on-the-job experience as an auxiliary principal and knowledge of the principal gained through on-the-job experience as an appointed building principal;

knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a teacher and that gained while a counselor, administrative assistant to principal or other in-classroom teaching position.

Confidant at the .02 level that a significant relationship exists between:

on-the-job experience, as an auxiliary principal and knowledge gained of principalship through observation while a teacher;

on-the-job experience as an auxiliary principal and knowledge gained through contacts and/or conversations with a specific principal.

Confidant at the .01 level that a significant relationship exists between:

informal transmittal of experience from veteran principals and knowledge gained through contact and/or conversations with a specific principal;

knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a teacher and that gained while a director, supervisor, or other administrative position.

Confidant at the .001 level that a significant relationship exists between:

number of buildings taught in and number of principals worked for;

informal transmittal of experience from other auxiliary principals and from veteran principals;

informal transmittal of experience from veteran principals and knowledge gained of principalship through observation while a teacher;

knowledge gained of principalship through observations of principal while a teacher and knowledge gained through contacts and/or conversations with a specific principal;

knowledge of the principalship gained through observation of principal while a director, supervisor, or other administrative position and that gained through contacts and/or specific conversations with a specific principal.

Results of the analysis of variance conducted comparing relationships between questionnaire categories and the principals' Scores of various role socialization ratings, showed no significant differences. This was probably due to sample size.

Implications

Newly appointed principals (auxiliaries) gain their knowledge of the job from three main sources:

1) Observations of principals while in another role in the system
2) Conversations about the role of the principal with a specific principal while in another role in the system
3) Informal transmittal of experiences from other auxiliaries as well as veteran principals.

Despite inservice training provided by the School District and the administrator's bargaining unit, newly appointed principals find that they must train to service while on the job. Although inservice programs prepare principals on the various bureaucratic sides of the role (scheduling, payroll, intricacies of the contract, etc.) the ramifications of the informal aspects of the role are never stressed.

Some of the concerns of newly appointed principals are how to proportion their time, which forms are really important, what do you do if a deadline passes, or how do you get a textbook company to deliver books on time if it means circumventing the system. These concerns and other informal bureaucratic procedures are not transmitted through inservice.

Also, the areas of curriculum management, classroom observation, handling stressful situations between staff, students, community members or various combinations of same and largely ignored by inservice. Teachers and other role aspirants in the school district become socialized into the principalship prior to their selection as

a principal. Apparently, as one begins to aspire to the role of principal, a specific principal is chosen who serves as a role model. Initial decisions on career movement (taking the principal's exam) are determined during this period. Moreover, these role models predetermine in the aspirant's mind the kind and type of role activities one can expect to perform.

Inservice courses are devoted entirely to the task of assuring that these new principals will be able to keep the system moving. Hence, the stress on the formal aspects of the role. In an attempt to make inservice programs more meaningful to new principals, programs should also be devoted to the various aspects of the job stressed by the informal network. Veteran principals, as opposed to central office administrators, could conduct various programs on assorted aspects of the principal role. In this manner, the inservice program would compliment the informal structure of transmittal of experience. Additionally, inservice programs could be developed for school district personnel who may be considering becoming a principal. This type of program could help individuals to make a change prior to entering a certification and examination process, which also acts as a pre-screening device for the School District.

This study was conducted over a two and one-half year period in a large northeastern school district. Although the field study portion was extensive, involving over sixty principals, the statistical portion drew a small sample of principals. The correlation which resulted from the statistical data tended to support the notes and data of the field study. Generalizations made about the socialization of novice principals, based on a small sample, must be made

with caution. Future research must be conducted in other school districts to determine the extent of the informal network on principal socialization. If the findings of this study hold across other school districts, inservice programs could be developed cooperatively among school districts. Furthermore, cooperation between school districts and local university certification programs could produce programs at both levels that are more meaningful to aspiring principals.

If school districts expect to have a viable, flexible process that constantly adapts to the various pressures of the environment, principals must be prepared to meet these demands at the building level. An effective inservice program, stressing the formal and informal aspects of the principal's role, could produce principals who have confidence in themselves, and, hence, will be secure in the decision-making processes that implement and enforce the school systems goals and objectives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard N. "Power in Human Societies: A Synthesis", The Anthropology of Power, Academic Press, New York, 1977.

Barrileaux, Louis. "Behavioral Outcomes for Administrative Internships: School Principals", Educational Administration Quarterly, Volume 8, no. 1, Winter 1972.

Barth, Roland S. "How to Ensure an Effective Principalship", The National Elementary Principal, March 1980.

Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization", in James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally & Company, 1965.

Bohannan, Paul. "You Can't Do Nothing", American Anthropologist, Vol. 82, number 3, September 1980.

Caldwell, Brian J. "A Competency-Based Approach to Administrator Assessment and In-Service", paper presented at International Congress on Education (2nd, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, June 1979.)

Carlson, Richard O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1962.

Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm. The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Aldine Publishing, Chicago, 1967.

Gold, Raymond L. "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", Social Forces, Vol. 36, 217-223, 1958.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2, March 1958, pp. 444-480.

Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Schools, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1965.

Hoy, Wayne K. and Aho, Fred. "Patterns of Succession of High School Principals and Organizational Change", Planning and Changing, Vol. 2 (1973), 82-88.

Hoy, Wayne K. & Miskel, Cecil G. Educational Administration, Random House, New York, 1978.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966.

Kunz, Daniel and Hoy, Wayne K. "Leader Behavior of Principals and the Professional Zone of Acceptance of Teachers", Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 12 (1976).

Lane, Willard R.; Corwin, Ronald G.; Monahan, William G. Foundations of Educational Administration; Macmillan Company, Collier-Macmillan Limited, London, 1967.

Mascaro, Francis G. "Early-on-the-Job Socialization of First-Year Elementary School Principals", paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco; April 1976.

Miskel, Cecil. Public School Principals' Leader Style, Organizational Situation, and Effectiveness: Final Report. Washington, D.C. National Institute of Education, Dept. H.E.W. Grant no. NE-G-00-3-0141, Oct. 1974.

Murray, U.V. and Corenblum, Alan F. "Loyalty to Immediate Supervisor at Alternate Hierarchical Levels in a Bureaucracy", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 62, 1966.

Nicholson, Everett W. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome", paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals' 56th Annual Convention, Anaheim, California, March 17-22, 1972.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 6, 1962.

Roe, W.; Haak, L. and McIntyre, E. "Creating an Informed Citizenry", Michigan Educational Journal, Vol. 32, 1954.

APPENDIX A

	CATEGORIES										SCORES									
A	5	1	2	3	3	4	2	5	4	4	65	65	13	26	13	13	13	26	13	13
B	4	3	2	3	5	5	3	1	2	2	42	65	46	41	37	65	45	65	65	22
C	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	52	65	31	53	46	46	48	41	41	23
D	5	1	3	3	1	3	2	2	3	3	56	65	30	30	21	50	56	50	36	31
E	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	1	5	4	46	65	15	59	54	63	62	57	52	13
F	3	4	3	3	5	5		2	4	4	49	65	34	35	37	65	34	65	39	19
G	5	4	2	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	45	65	16	50	34	55	22	65	45	13
H	4	3	1	3	1	4	3	3	5	2	57	65	46	59	46	49	52	53	44	38
I	5	3	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	2	58	63	38	40	46	64	48	38	44	40
J	4	2	4	3	1	2	2	3	5	4	28	52	13	37	25	58	65	31	26	13
K	5	4	2	3	5	5	5	5	4	2	44	65	37	37	37	53	37	31	13	17
L	5	1	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	47	65	40	65	47	50	65	65	55	18
M	4	1	2	3	5	5	1	1	3	3	51	57	43	46	40	55	33	37	41	17
N	5	1	4	3	3	4	5	3	3	2	33	43	27	35	26	27	26	41	29	13
O	4	4	4	3	5	5	2	1	4	4	31	65	40	43	26	39	65	65	23	19
P	5	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	45	50	46	42	40	65	64	47	42	16
Q	4	1	4	3	1	3	3	2	2	4	52	65	30	36	29	46	38	65	30	16
R	5	4	4	3	5	5	3	2	4	4	53	65	51	13	17	57	45	57	49	17
S	3	4	3	3	2	4	2	5	3	2	21	65	13	13	13	13	51	25	20	13
T	5	2	1	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	65	65	13	39	13	13	13	13	13	13

APPENDIX B

Role Socialization of Novice Principals

Questionnaire Categories

1. I was appointed a principal, not necessarily to my current assignment,
   1) less than one year
   2) 1-2 years
   3) 2-3 years
   4) 3-4 years
   5) 4-5 years

2. The size of the staff (regular classroom)
   1) 10 or under
   2) 10 to 15
   3) 15 to 20
   4) over 20

3. The number of programs related to foreign-speaking youngsters is
   1) none
   2) one
   3) two or more

4. The number of years in education, teaching, supervising and administrating, equals:
   1) 5 years or less
   2) 5 to 10 years
   3) Over 10 years

5. As a teacher, how many different buildings did you teach in?
   1) One
   2) Two
   3) Three
   4) Four
   5) Five or more

6. During your total years as a teacher, you worked for how many principals?
   1) One
   2) Two
   3) Three
   4) Four
   5) Five or more

7. The time between your decision to become a principal and your acquiring principal certification was:
   1) Less than a year
   2) One-two years
   3) Three-four years
   4) Five years
   5) More than five years

8. The time between acquiring your principal certification and being appointed from the principal's list was:
   1) Less than a year
   2) One-two years
   3) Three-four years
   4) Five years
   5) More than five years

9. How much time did you serve as an auxiliary principal?
   1) None
   2) Less than six months
   3) Six months to a year
   4) One to two years
   5) More than two years

10. Approximately how many school assignments were you given as an auxiliary?
    1) None 2) 1-2 3) 2-5 4) More than 5

APPENDIX C

SCORES

Principals' ratings of the helpfulness of various aspects of their own role socialization from very high to very low (13 to 65)

1. In-service programs provided by the school district.

2. In-service programs provided by professional organizations/ unions.

3. On-the-job experience as an auxiliary principal.

4. Informal transmittal of experience from other auxiliary principals.

5. Informal transmittal of experience from veteran (more than 5 years) principals.

6. Knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a teacher.

7. Knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a counselor, administrative assistant to principal or other in-classroom teaching position.

8. Knowledge of the principalship gained through observation of principal while a director, supervisor or in other administrative position.

9. Knowledge of the principalship gained through contacts and/or conversations with a specific principal.

10. Knowledge of the principalship gained through on-the-job experience as an appointed building principal.

APPENDIX D

CORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF PRINCIPALS' RATINGS FROM VERY MUCH (LOWEST SCORE) TO VERY LITTLE (HIGHEST SCORE) OF THE HELPFULNESS OF VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THEIR OWN ROLE SOCIALIZATION

A On-the-job experience as an auxiliary principal
Mean = 31.1 S.D. = 13.12

B Informal transmittal of experience from other auxiliary principals
Mean = 40.0 S.D. = 13.58

C Informal transmittal of experience from veteran principals
Mean = 32.4 S.D. = 12.69

D Knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a teacher
Mean = 47.3 S.D. = 17.56

E Knowledge gained of principalship through observation of principal while a counselor, administrative assistant to principal or other in-classroom teaching position
Mean = 44.1 S.D. = 16.82

F Knowledge of the principalship gained through observation of principal while a director, supervisor or in other administrative position
Mean = 46.9 S.D. = 16.28

G Knowledge of the principalship gained through contacts and/or conversations with a specific principal
Mean = 36.0 S.D. = 14.74

H Knowledge of the principalship gained through on-the-job experience as an appointed building principal
Mean = 19.2 S.D. = 8.12

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
A	.14	.40	.54*	.33	.47*	.51*	.48*
B		.81***	.36	.26	.35	.45	.22
C			.69***	.40	.43	.64**	.38
D				.48*	.59**	.71***	.33
E					.36	.39	.27
F						.68***	.15
G							.32
H							-

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$